IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FIREARM OWNERS AGAINST

CRIME, et al.,

Plaintiffs : No. 1:15-cv-00322

:

v. :

(Judge Kane)

CITY OF HARRISBURG, <u>et al.</u>,

Defendants

ORDER

THE BACKGROUND OF THIS ORDER IS AS FOLLOWS:

Before the Court is Defendants' motion for sanctions for fraud on the court. (Doc. Nos. 32-33.) In their motion, Defendant argue that Plaintiffs made untruthful representations to this Court and to the Dauphin County Court of Common Pleas regarding the nature of relief sought in this action, so the Court should use its inherent authority to impose sanctions. (Doc. No. 33.) In particular, Defendants aver that Plaintiffs represented to this Court that they never sought compensatory damages when, Defendants argue, the state court record reveals that Plaintiffs did seek compensatory damages in connection to the default judgment obtained in that court. (Doc. No. 33 at 1-3.) The imposition of sanctions pursuant to a court's inherent authority is discretionary and is "governed not by rule or statute but by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." Republic of Philippines v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp., 43 F.3d 65, 73 (3d Cir. 1994) (quoting Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 43 (1991)).

After reviewing the parties' motions and supporting briefs, the Court finds that sanctions would not serve the interests of justice or aid in the efficient adjudication of this action.

ACCORDINGLY, on this 25th day of March 2016, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT the

Defendants' motion for sanctions (Doc. No. 32) is **DENIED**.

S/ Yvette Kane Yvette Kane, District Judge United States District Court Middle District of Pennsylvania